AD-753 461

REVIEW OF NAVY CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION FIELD ACTIVITIES

Logistics Management Institute

Prepared for:

Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement and Production)

November 1972

DISTRIBUTED BY:




National Technical Information Service U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield Va. 22151

REVIEW OF NAVY CONTRACY ADMINISTRATION FIELD ACTIVITIES

LMI Task 71-8.

November 1972



Prepared pursuant to Department of Defense Contract No. SD-271. Views or conclusions contained in this document should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the Department of Defense. Except for use for Government purposes, permission to guote from or reproduce portions of this document must be obtained from the Logistics Management Institute.

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield VA 22151

LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE 4701 Sangamore Road Washington, D. C. 20016

Approved for public releases

Distribution Unlimited

	Classification	1 .	\ .		a. nd
	SIFIED	DOCUMENT CO body of abstract and inde	ONTROP DATA -		
. OPIGINATING A	CTIVITY (Corporate a		2	Ze. HEPORT S	ECURITY CL#551F1
•	gamore Road		-	Zb. GROUP	CLASSIFIED
	on, D. C.	20016			
3. REPORT TITLE				•	
	Review of	Navy Contract	Administra	tion Field	1 Activiti
4. DESCRIPTIVE P	NOTE1 (T) pe of repor	t and inclusive dates)			· .
S. ANTHORISI /Fir	st name, middle initie	N. Jantanas			
•	•	is take namey			•
•	·	•			
REPORT DATE			78. TOTAL NO	OF PAGES	78. NO. OF REFS
SO. CONTRACT OF	November	1972	94. ORIGINAY	85 DR'S REPORT NUM	BER(S)
	SD-271				
S. PROJECT NO.	147	•	. LMI T	ask Order	\T-8
c.		•	90. OTHER HE this report)	PORT NOIS (Any o	other numbers that a
d.					
10. DISTRIBUTION	STATEMENT			•	·//
			Donutu	Chief of	Naval Mat
		•	1		
staffing	criteria f	purpose of to For Navy SUPSH	(Procu his report IP and NAVP	was to de	d Producti velop quan s. A seco
staffing purpose wanagement data on pecember total control relates as required.	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o		(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	was to de RO office of tool for istical a period Janich can be quirements oases for modology,	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques
staffing purpose wanagement data on staffing December total control relations as required.	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o	for Navy SUPSH empt to develope method used equirements for ations were distration per can also be us Circular A-11	(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	was to de RO office of tool for istical a period Janich can be quirements oases for modology,	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques
staffing purpose wanagement data on pecember total control relates as required.	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o	for Navy SUPSH empt to develope method used equirements for ations were distration per can also be us Circular A-11	(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	was to de RO office of tool for istical a period Janich can be quirements oases for modology,	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques
staffing purpose wanagement data on pecember total control relates as required.	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o	for Navy SUPSH empt to develope method used equirements for ations were distration per can also be us Circular A-11	(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	was to de RO office of tool for istical a period Janich can be quirements oases for modology,	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques
staffing purpose wanagement data on pecember total control relates as required.	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o	for Navy SUPSH empt to develope method used equirements for ations were distration per can also be us Circular A-11	(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	was to de RO office of tool for istical a period Janich can be quirements oases for modology,	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques
staffing purpose wanagement data on secomber total control relates as required.	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o	for Navy SUPSH empt to develope method used equirements for ations were distration per can also be us Circular A-11	(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	was to de RO office of tool for istical a period Janich can be quirements oases for modology,	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques
staffing purpose wanagement data on secomber total control relates as required.	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o	for Navy SUPSH empt to develope method used equirements for ations were distration per can also be us Circular A-11	(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	was to de RO office of tool for istical a period Janich can be quirements oases for modology,	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques
staffing purpose wanagement data on pecember total control relates as required.	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o	for Navy SUPSH empt to develope method used equirements for ations were distration per can also be us Circular A-11	(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	was to de RO office of tool for istical a period Janich can be quirements oases for modology,	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques
staffing purpose wanagement data on pecember total control relates as required.	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o	for Navy SUPSH empt to develope method used equirements for ations were distration per can also be us Circular A-11	(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	was to de RO office of tool for istical a period Janich can be quirements oases for modology,	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques
staffing purpose wanagement data on December total control as requirelation	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o red in OMB ships can b	for Navy SUPSH empt to develope method used equirements for ations were distration per can also be us Circular A-11	(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	rement an was to de RO office of tool for istical a period Janich can be uirements bases for modology, producti	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques vity measu
staffing purpose wanagement data on staffing December total control relations as required.	criteria f was to atte nt use. Th staffing re 1971. Equ ntract admi tionships o red in OMB ships can b	for Navy SUPSH empt to develope method used equirements for ations were distration per can also be us Circular A-11	(Procu his report IP and NAVP p a plannin was a stat r the time eveloped wh rsonnel reg ed as the b	was to de RO office g tool for istical a period Ja ich can be quirements asses for modology, producti	d Producti velop quan s. A seco r internal nalysis of nuary 1967 e used to in field staffing of techniques

SUMMARY

With the sponsorship of the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement and Production) and the Commander, Naval Ship Systems Command, the Logistics Management Institute was requested by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) to undertake a task for the review of offices of Supervisors of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN and Naval Plant Representatives. The task included a review and analysis of the organization, functional responsibilities, interface relationships, workload trends, and staffing criteria for those offices.

An interim report was issued to the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement and Production) in October 1971 presenting our conclusions and recommendations on organization, functional responsibilities, and interface relationships.

This is our final report and covers the second phase of our review. The primary purpose of the second phase was to develop quantitative staffing criteria for certain Navy contract administration field personnel requirements. A secondary purpose was to attempt to develop a planning tool for internal Navy management use. The method used was a statistical analysis of empirical data on staffing requirements for the time period January 1967 through December 1971.

We have had only limited success in accomplishing those purposes. We conclude that statistical review of historical data is not an appropriate technique for determination of an optimum staffing level for a specific office or for divisions

within an office. Assuming, however, that the Navy continues to manage its field contract administration services offices in a manner similar to that used in the 1967-1971 time frame, we developed equations which can be used, on a Systems Command basis, to estimate future total contract administration personnel requirements.

In addition, the relationships presented in this study can be used as the statistical bases for staffing criteria in satisfaction of the requirements of OMB Circular A-ll. We believe that the methodology, analytical techniques, and, at least, some of the relationships can be used in the area of productivity measurement. We recommend that the Systems Commands have the flexibility to level out peak and slack work periods by allowing them to operate within a reasonable range of the computed staffing level and that the relationships presented in this report be periodically updated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The same of the sa

To constitution of the

		<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ii
LIST OF	TABLES AND FIGURES	. v
ABBREVIA	TIONS	vi
CHAPTER	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS	4
II.	RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9
		9
	A. SUPSHIP Staffing Criteria	_
	B. NAVAIR NAVPRO Staffing Criteria	14
	C. NAVORD NAVPRO Staffing Criteria	15
	D. Conclusions and Recommendations	18
	E. Use of Results	22
IV.	SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGY	24
	A. Data Collection	26
	.B. Analysis	27
	C. Testing	30
	D. Other Statistical Findings	35
	D. Other Statistical Findings	33
APPENDIC	ES	
A.	Task Order and Related Documents	
В.	Offices Visited Definitions of Variables Used	
C. D.	Data Summary	
E.	Statistical Definitions	
	Results for SUPSHIP/NAVPRO Departments/Divisions	
G.	Adjustment for Serialization	

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

<u>Figure</u>		Page
1A	Staffing Criteria for Offices of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN	11
18	Adjusting Variable for Staffing Criteria for Offices of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN	12
2	Staffing Criteria for Naval Plant Representative Offices—Naval Air Systems Command	16
3	Staffing Criteria for Naval Plant Representative Offices—Naval Ordnance Systems Command	19
4	Standard Error, Confidence Level, and Range of Observation	25
<u>Table</u>		
1	Summary of Data and Variances—SUPSHIPS	13
2	Summary of Data and Variances—NAVAIR NAVPROs .	17
3	Summary of Data and Variances-NAVORD NAVPROs .	20
4	Test of SUPSHIP Staffing Criteria	31
5	Test of NAVAIR NAVPRO Staffing Criteria	33
6	Test of NAVORD NAVPRO Staffing Criteria	34

SALAR S

B Cotton

A SAN

THE STATE OF THE S

Company

No. of the Control of

Library 1

1

ABBREVIATIONS

Throughout this report, a number of acronyms and abbreviations have been used. The following list is supplied to help the reader with those terms with which he is not familiar.

ASPR Armed Services	Procurement	Regulation
---------------------	-------------	------------

CAS Contract administration services

CI Confidence interval

CV Coefficient of variation

LMI Logistics, Management Institute

MAT Naval Material Command Headquarters

NAVAIR Naval Air Systems Command

NAVAIRINST Naval Air Systems Command Instruction

NAVMAT Naval Material Command

NAVORD Naval Ordnance Systems Command

NAVORDINST Naval Ordnance Systems Command Instruction

NAVPR the Naval Plant Representative

NAVPRO Naval Plant Representative Office

NAVSHIPS Naval Ship Systems Command

OCMM Office of Civilian Manpower Management-Navy

OMB Office of Management and Budget

OPNAV Office of the Chief of Naval Operations

OPNAVINST Instruction issued by the Office of the Chief

of Naval Operations

R² Coefficient of determination

SACAM Ship Acquisition Contract Administration Manual

SE Standard error

SUPSHIP Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and

Repair, USN

SYSCOM Naval Systems Command

I. INTRODUCTION

In December 1970, the Logistics Management Institute (LMI) undertook the task of reviewing the organization, functional assignments, workload, and staffing criteria of Navy CAS activities at the initiative of the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement and Production). Only those offices designated as a Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair (SUPSHIP) or Naval Plant Representative (NAVPRO) were included. Other Navy offices designated as CAS components (Inspectors of Naval Material-Petroleum, Navy Fuel Supply Offices, Naval Regional Procurement Offices, Branch Offices of the Office of Naval Research, and Offices of Naval Research Resident Representative) were excluded from the study.

In March 1971, the task was amended to include the attempted development of staffing criteria for Navy field CAS offices. The Commander, Naval Ship Systems Command requested the amendment in order to assist that Command in meeting the requirement for staffing criteria specified in Bureau of the Budget (now the Office of Management and Budget) Circular A-11, Section 13.3. (Appendix A).

The original intent of the amended task was the development of staffing criteria for SUPSHIP offices for inclusion in OPNAV Instruction 5310.5A, "U. S. Navy Staffing Criteria Manual for Activities Ashore." (SUPSHIPS are not presently included in that Instruction.) MAT 02 amended the NAVSHIPS request to include a reevaluation and possible redevelopment of the NAVPRO criteria shown in Section 71 of OPNAVINST 5310.5A.

The project was conducted in two phases. From March through October 1971, emphasis was placed on the organizational and functional aspects of the task. The Commands and offices specified in Section 1.B.1. of the task order were visited and each CAS supervisor was interviewed. In the field offices, each department or division director was also interviewed. In addition, visits were made to the appropriate offices in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), the Directorate for Contract Administration Services of the Defense Supply Agency, the Air Force Systems Command, and the Air Force Contract Management Division.

On the basis of those interviews, a review of the organization and functional assignments for CAS offices was made and submitted to MAT 02 in an interim report issued in October, 1971.

This final report presents the results of the staffing criteria phase of the study. The major portion of the field work indicated in Appendix B was performed in this phase. In spite of the complete and thorough cooperation we received from all our study contacts, it should be recognized that any attempt to identify significant empirical relationships in the area of human activity will probably yield a larger margin of error than an analysis of physical or natural phenomena. The data used in the study were heavily impacted by such qualitative considerations as individual motivation, personalities of supervisors and subordinates, orders from higher supervisory echelons, etc. The subject of the significance of the data and results is discussed more fully later in the report.

Prior to starting the second phase, the technique to be used to develop staffing criteria was carefully reviewed with

the Navy. It was generally agreed that the most reliable determination of the number of personnel which should be in a CAS office required the use of industrial engineering techniques. Because of practical manpower constraints, it was decided that the next best alternative would be a statistical review of empirical data over a specified time period. In addition to criteria for the total number of personnel in a field CAS office, we were also to attempt to develop guidelines for the number of people in the various divisions/departments usually found in a NAVPRO/SUPSHIP. Chapters III and IV and Appendices C through G detail the methodology, results, and recommendations of that review.

alle accompany of the accompany of the company of t

THE PARTY OF THE P

The report assumes some reader familiarity with contract administration services functions and basic statistical concepts. A list of abbreviations is provided for those less familiar with the acronyms used in the report while the chapter on methodology includes some background information on statistics.

II. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The use of statistical techniques on empirical data to develop a planning tool imposes certain restrictions and implies specific assumptions. It is necessary to realize the limitations of the analyses in order to place the results in their proper perspective.

1. Comprehensiveness of Variables

The specific variables chosen for study were determined by asking each SUPSHIP/NAVPR and each department/division director visited during the first part of the study to identify measurable actions or indicators which he believed had an impact on the work performed in his office. This list was added to and modified through discussions with CAS personnel at the headquarters level and through subjective analyses made within LMI.

The variables for which we obtained data were, therefore, considered to be a reasonably complete list of significant,
quantifiable events and actions which indicate an office's
workload. Some data were not included in the study, such as:

- a. quantifiable variables, common to all CAS offices, which were considered insufficiently significant to warrant their inclusion in the final descriptive equation.
- b. quantifiable variables which were unique to one or a few offices and could not be applied to the larger groups of offices for which relationships were developed.

c. qualitative variables which were excluded from this study but which exert a significant impact on workload or the way in which the workload is handled.

Another significant assumption was that a linear or log-linear model adequately describes the empirical data.

2. Causative vs. Associative Effects

In using regression analysis, one tries to examine the effect that some variable exerts on others and to find a functional relationship among the variables expressed as a mathematical equation. A distinction is made between independent and dependent variables. The variable being "explained" is the dependent variable. Independent variables are those that are found to exert an influence on the dependent variable.

The relationship between the dependent and independent variable may be either causative or associative. For the most part, the variables we used are associative in nature rather than causative. For instance, "value shipped," one of the independent variables studied, appeared to have a strong correlation with the number of personnel needed to man an office. However, this is an associative variable. The fact that some goods of definite value were produced by a contractor does not, in itself, cause work in the government office. Rather, the contract terms, the requirements of ASPR, and various procurement rules and regulations define the amount of inspection to be performed, the forms to be filled out, the reviews and approvals to be made, etc. The value of the goods produced is merely a convenient measure of the cumulative effects of all the legal requirements which are the true causes of the workload.

An assumption in this study is that the variables measured, though they may be associative, are reasonable measures of the work required to be performed by an office.

3. Representative Sampling

In the Continental United States, there are 16 SUPSHIP offices, 9 NAVAIR NAVPROS, and 6 NAVORD NAVPROS. Of these, we visited 10 SUPSHIPS, 7 NAVAIR NAVPROS and 5 NAVORD NAVPROS. Although the sample represents well over 50% of each population, there is still some question whether each office should be considered as a part of a homogeneous organization or whether it is sufficiently unique to warrant individual consideration. Various offices will differ because of the existence of branch offices, bailed aircraft, floating drydocks, unique products, special contractor relationships, etc.

We acknowledge the unique characteristics of the various SUPSHIP/NAVPRO offices. We endeavored, however, to include most extremes within our range of observations. For instance, we included large and small offices, repair and new construction, conventional airframe, helicopter, and electronics manufacturers, research and hardware-oriented offices, etc. We, therefore, believe our sample to be representative of the many types of offices found in the SUPSHIP/NAVPRO organizations.

4. Sample Size

The limited number of offices in each SYSCOM population is too small to warrant the assumption of a normal distribution for any sample of the offices.

We attempted to overcome the problem of sample size by collecting data for ten points in time for each of the

selected offices. The initial regression equations were computed from those data. We then recognized that a specific time-observation is not completely independent of preceding or subsequent observations. For that reason we then limited our sample size for analysis to three or four time periods which are farther apart from each other in time and would allow us to look at observations which did not have a direct relationship with one another. In this manner, we used a minimum of twenty sample observations per SYSCOM from which new regression equations were computed. Since these equations did not vary significantly from those using ten time points and since we are not ignorant of the population parameters which the equations describe, we are confident that the sample size is adequate for describing the desired relationships even though it may fall short of the requisite size for normalcy.

5. Data Accuracy

A significant limitation is the expected accuracy of the data used in the analyses. We endeavored to check, edit, and verify all collected data to a reasonable extent. Some obvious errors were corrected when found, and unofficial records were used when they appeared to be more reliable or were the only sources available. Errors were especially prevalent for the 1967-1968 time frame. It must be recognized, however, that some data might be erroneous because of misunderstanding of definitions, incomplete or inaccurate records, or human error. In addition, we believe that there was enough inconsistency in the way records were maintained and reports generated that an LMI recommendation on improved data retrieval is appropriate although peripheral to the subject of this study.

In order to conduct the analysis with the chosen techniques, a proxy was required in those few instances where no data were available on a variable for an observation. A mean was inserted in those instances, as may be seen in Appendix D.

6. Mission Consistency

THE SECTION OF THE PROPERTY OF

A possible limitation which we encountered and one which should be carefully considered in any future updating of the data base is the consistency of mission definition among similar offices. We found that some offices are responsible for other than CAS functions. The dependent variables (personnel) would, therefore, be inflated with respect to the independent variables. In this study, we adjusted the dependent variable (when possible) to account for those added functions.

A related limitation occurs when an office is not performing all of the CAS functions. In those cases, there was no good way to adjust the independent variable, since none of them was thought to be solely or exclusively related to one department. This is a source of error in this study, and management judgment should be used to modify the results as they would appear to apply to such offices. This source of error is not significant, however, when viewing total SYSCOM staffing needs, so long as the SYSCOM is not required to perform additional functions with the resources indicated by the equations in this study.

III. RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary results of this study are the equations, noted below, which describe the staffing relationships for CAS offices. The equations were derived from data describing individual office staff relationships. However, when the equations were used to compute the staffing levels of individual offices, a wide variance between the computed and actual levels was noted (Tables 1 through 3).

Because of these wide variances, it was believed that the equations would yield better results (reduced variances) if they were used only to describe the aggregate staff levels of an entire Systems Command. A limited test of the equations which aggregated the individual office results to the Systems Command level (Tables 4 through 6) verifies that reduced variances are realized when the computed staff levels are aggregated at that level.

The following equations should be considered in the context that they provide an acceptable description of staffing requirements only at the Systems Command level.

A. SUPSHIP STAFFING CRITERIA.

SUPSHIP offices are not covered by formal staffing criteria in OPNAVINST 5310.5A. This does not imply, however, that NAVSHIPS has not applied some informal criteria as a guide in allocating billets. This LMI study indicates that a reasonable correlation existed from 1967 through 1971 between progress payments, changes processed, and staff levels. These relationships are shown on Figures 1A and 1B. It should be noted that

a more rigorous presentation would show the confidence level envelope on Figure 1A with hyperbolic rather than linear bounds. The 68% confidence level at the mean would equal the standard error. We have shown an envelope with constant boundaries equal to the standard error for the sake of simplicity. Figure 1A also plots the raw data corrected for the changes processed. Table 1 lists the observed values, calculated values and variances for the original observations.


The algebraic expression for these relationships is:


$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{i} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (i70.8 (\log X_{1}) + 0.013X_{2} - 620)_{i}$$

where

- Y = Total computed personnel estimate (military and civilian) for the ith SUPSHIP office for the projected time frame.
- X₁ = Annual rate, for the projected time frame, of
 progress payments and other payments (in thousands
 of dollars) to contractors representing work
 accomplished.
- X₂ = Annual processing rate, for the rojected time frame of changes, change orders, cost/price proposals, contract or job modifications and other contract changes requiring SUPSHIP effort or review.
- n = Number of SUPSHIP offices being estimated. This equation has a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.75.

The data on SUPSHIP 3 and SUPSHIP 4 were not used in calculating the relationship since those offices fall far outside the range of observations.





SOLVER SPECIES SERVICE SERVICE

Table 1
SUMMARY OF DATA AND VARIANCES—SUPSHIPS

(1)	No. of Pe	rsonnel		
Data Point	Computed	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Variance</u>	% Variance
13-2	124	105	-19	-18 :
13-6	155	127	-28	-22
13-9	149	109	-40	-36
14-2	65	63	-2	~3
14-6	27	56	· 29	52
14-9	- 7	50	57	114
15-2	377	364	-1 3	-4
15-6	376	360	-16	- 4,
15-9	· 427	383	-44	-1.1
16-2	307	415	108	26
16-6	326	366	40	1.1
16-9	345	390	45	1.2
17-2	224	201	-23	-11
17-6	283	257	- 26	-10
17-9	260	195	~ 65	33
18-2	201	139	-62	-4 5
18-6	259	182	- 77	-4 2
18-9	319	259	- 60	-23
19-2	188	179	-9	- 5
19-6	222	204	-18	-9
19-9	244	222	22	10
20-2	176	112	-64	- 57
20-6	171	95	-7 6	-80
20-9	130	69	-61	- 88
21-2	270	409	139	34
21-6	269	342	73	. 21
21-9	342	295	-47	-16
22-2	300	364	64	18
22-6	199	322	123	38
22-9	206	253	47	19

NOTE:

(1) Data point designations rerer to underlined observations listed in Appendix D.

B. NAVAIR NAVPRO STAFFING CRITERIA

The major difference between NAVPRO offices (both for NAVAIR and NAVORD) and SUPSHIP offices is that the amount of variation in the staffing levels which is "explained" by the regression equation (R²) is much greater for the NAVPROS. (For NAVAIR NAVPROS, R² equals 0.91.) We believe this improved variation to be, in part, attributable to the fact that NAVPROS have been following a staffing pattern based upon the criteria promulgated in OPNAV Instruction 5310.5A (Section 71).

That Instruction provides for government personnel as a function of "number of contractors' technical personnel," "number of contractors' direct personnel," "number of contractors' quality assurance personnel," etc. At the start of our analysis, we found a high correlation between "value shipped" and those variables noted above (we also collected data on the same variables). The methodology that we used and summarized in Section IV.B., indicated that "value shipped" provided a closer relationship to government personnel than those other variables. We, therefore, used the one variable as a descriptor.

Figure 2 shows the graph of the equation for NAVAIR NAVPROS, the data points used in calculating the relationship, and the 68% confidence interval. Table 2 lists the observed data, the calculated values and the variances for each observation. The equation described in Figure 2 is:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (39 + 0.00024X_{1})_{i}$$

Note the comment on page 10 concerning the shape of the confidence limit boundaries.

where

Y = Total computed personnel estimate (military and civilian) for the ith NAVAIR NAVPRO office for the projected time frame.

X₁ = Annual rate (in thousands of dollars), for the
 projected time frame, of the value of material
 and goods shipped to the government from the
 contractor's plant.

n = Number of NAVAIR NAVPRO offices being estimated.

C. NAVORD NAVPRO STAFFING CRITERIA


As in the case of NAVAIR, staffing criteria for NAVORD NAVPROS are also provided in OPNAVINST 5310.5A. The equation describing their historical staffing relationships gives the best "fit" (R² = .92) of the three SYSCOMS. That can be deceiving, however, in light of the coefficient of variation (CV) of 25%. Figure 3 shows the plot of the original data, the resulting equation and the limits set by one standard error. Table 3 lists the observed data, the calculated values and the variances for each observation. The equation is:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_{1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (0.00081X_{1} - 15)_{i}$$

where

Y_i = Total computed personnel estimate (military and civilian) for the ith NAVORD NAVPRO office for the projected time frame.

Note the comment on page 10 concerning the shape of the confidence limit boundaries.



TAN TO THE TERMINATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PR

Table 2
SUMMARY OF DATA AND VARIANCES—NAVAIR NAVPROS

	No. of Pe	rsonnel		
Data Point (1)	Computed	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Variance</u>	% Variance
6-2	228	229	1 .	0
6-5	248	247	-1	0
6-7	181	222	41	18
6-9	224	223	-1	0
7-2	101	93	- 8	-9
7-5	84	95	-11	-12
7-7	98	78	- 20	-2 6
7- 9	· 81	76	-5 .	-7
8-2	291	292	1	0
8-5	283	296	13	4
8-7	248	285	37	13
8-9	234	214	-20	-9
9-2	86	133	47	35
9-5	111	128	17	13
9-7	187	111	- 76	-68
9-9	122	111	-11	-10
10-2	40	45	5	11
10-5	40	· 39	- 6	-15
10-7	40	38	-2	- 5
10-9	42	37	- 5	-14
11-2	130	127	- 3	-2
11-5	186	183	- 3	-2
11-7	195	178	-17	-10
11-9	151	163	12	7
12-2	111	135	24	18
12-5	130	125	~ 5	-4
12-7	138	120	-18	~15
12-9	154	119	-35	-29

NOTE:


(1) Data point designations refer to underlined observations listed in Appendix D.

- X₁ = Annual rate (in thousands of dollars), for the
 projected time frame, of the value of material
 and goods shipped to the government from the
 contractor's plant.
- n = Number of NAVORD NAVPRO offices being estimated.

D. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the tests shown in Chapter IV, we conclude that the equations developed for a group of offices are valid within the established confidence limits and over the range of values for which observations were made. Assuming that the Naval Systems Commands make a conscious decision to continue their past management practices for field CAS offices, we recommend that:

- 1) The relationships determined by the regression equations in this report can be used by the Naval Systems Commands as a management tool for projecting personnel staffing requirements.
- 2) The relationships of this study could be established as the statistical bases for staffing criteria in satisfaction of the requirements of OMB Circular A-11.
- 3) The relationships set forth in this report should be updated annually.
- 4) The Systems Commands should have flexibility to level out peak and slack work periods by allowing them to operate within a reasonable range of the computed staffing level. That range should consider operational circumstances as well as the fact that the equations describe "average" offices.



AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF

Table 3

SUMMARY OF DATA AND VARIANCES—NAVORD NAVPROS

No. of Personnel						
Data Point (1)	Computed	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Variance</u>	% Variance		
1-2	180	187	7	4		
1-5	192	171	-21	-12		
1-7	` 203	134	- 69	-51		
1-9	173	128	-45	- 35		
2-2	68	32	-36	-113		
2-5	61	32	-29	-91		
2-7	71	29	-42	-145		
2-9	73	41	- 32	- 78		
3-2	350	334	- 16	~ 5		
3-5	350	386	36	9		
3-7	376	381	5	1		
3-9	341	379	38	10		
4-2	58	88	30 ·	34		
4-5	59	101	42	· 42		
4-7	61	98	37	38		
4-9	48	98	50	51		
5-2	85	73	12	16		
5∸5	51	74	23	31		
5-7	46	60	14	23		
5 - 9	43	54	11	20		

NOTE:

(1) Data point designations refer to underlined observations listed in Appendix D.

5) NAVMAT should critically review and standardize the information gathering and reporting processes from the field offices.

The last recommendation is peripheral to the major concerns of the study but we believe it to be appropriate. The need for improved procedures was apparent to LMI during the data gathering phase of the study. Improved and standardized reporting procedures could provide a better understanding of CAS office staffing relationships.

We have not attempted to develop criteria on a detailed position basis, as set forth in OPNAVINST 5310.5A. However, relationships similar to those developed for an entire office were determined for departments/divisions within an office and are shown in Appendix F. Those relationships are subject to the assumptions and limitations discussed in Chapter II, as well as the other cautionary notes of this report.

However, as a starting point for future work by the Navy in establishing staffing criteria for individual offices, it is suggested that the staffing criteria in OPNAVINST 5310.5A be reviewed for consistency with the relationships set forth in this report.

A recent report of the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress discusses workload measurement and productivity in the Federal sector. We believe that the methodology, statistical techniques, and, at least, some of the relationships developed and presented in this report can be used by the Navy in meeting the recommendations of that report.

[&]quot;Measuring and Enhancing Productivity in the Federal Sector: A Study Prepared for the Use of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress of the United States by Representatives of the Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office and Office of Management and Budget, August 4, 1972.

E. USE OF RESULTS

The equations presented in this report produce unmeaningful results when they are used to predict the staffing level
for a specific office under current management criteria.

The reason for this is that the equations describe the
average relationships for offices when, in fact, there are
no "average" offices. By definition, some offices must fall
above the mean and some below it. Hence we do not recommend
the use of the equations for predicting the staff levels of
a specific office without concurrent changes in management
controls and practices.

We can, and do, recommend that the equations be used for estimating the total CAS office staff requirements for a SYSCOM, since individual office variances from the mean tend to cancel each other out when they are aggregated. Limiting the application of the equations to the SYSCOM level recognizes the fact that the SYSCOM is in a better position to estimate the total independent variable than are the individual offices. (For example, consider the case of two CAS offices estimating the impact of the same anticipated procurement—which will be awarded to only one contractor.)

The potential use of these equations could change, however, if the Navy were to alter its management practices. One alternative could be that CAS managers may accept these, or similar, equations as standards for all offices, permitting deviations only by explicit permission. We do not presume to specify or recommend such a specific policy standard since we believe that to be a prerogative of the Systems Command manager and should charge from one manager to another depending on his specific objectives and interests.

Chapter IV gives the results of testing the equations for both individual and total CAS office staff predictions under existing management practices. It shows the considerable improvement in variance achieved through aggregating the individual office results. Even so, there are still some differences between the computed and actual aggregate staff levels. The differences should not be disturbing since the regression equation only provides a point estimate of staffing levels given a point estimate for the independent variable. But the independent variable estimate may change from time to time in the course of a year. If followed to the letter, this would require CAS management to hire new staff or lay off people periodically throughout the year to meet the dictates of each new estimate. In practice, leveling of the workload is allowed by use of overtime, temporary help, and training programs. We agree with this policy and recommend that the SYSCOMS present any point estimate in the context of a range in which it proposes to manage. Hence, even though a SYSCOM might compute a specific overall personnel requirement, it is reasonable that they should expect to manage to within, say, 5 or 10 percent of that estimate—given the same conditions and requirements which existed in the prior five year period on which the equation is based. The concepts of the standard error and confidence interval, discussed in the next chapter, may be helpful in establishing a reasonable management range.

IV. SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGY

This Chapter summarizes the methods and techniques used in data collection, analysis, and testing. Detailed definitions of the statistical terms used in this Chapter are provided in Appendix E.

Prior to presenting the methodology, it may be help-ful to discuss and understand the concepts of standard error and confidence limits. The equations shown in this report represent an average in an apparent relationship between a dependent and one or more independent variables. Since they are averages, one should expect to find approximately one-half of the data observations higher than calculated from the equation and one-half lower.

In addition, since we observed only a sample of the total population, it should be expected that the equations would have changed, even though slightly, had we sampled different offices or different time periods.

It is those valid changes in the equations for which the standard error and confidence limits provide boundaries. Figure 4 provides a pictorial presentation of these concepts.




Fig. 4 Standard Error, Confidence Level, and Range of Observation

The standard error establishes a range in which the mean relationship might fall if other sets of data had been taken. One standard error (plus or minus) establishes the boundaries in which approximately two-thirds (68%) of relationships based on samples of the population would fall. Approximately two standard errors establishes the boundaries for 95% of the mean relationships. (Note the comment on the shape of the confidence limit boundaries in Section III. A.)

For example, if we were to repeat our data sampling procedures 20 times and develop 20 relationships from the sampled data, then 19 out of the 20 relationships would be within two standard errors of our present results and 13 of the 20 relationships would be within one standard error.

A convenient way of measuring the relative importance of a standard error (SE) is through the coefficient of variation (CV) which is defined as the standard error divided by the mean of the dependent variable. In the area of staffing criteria, a standard error of 50 with a mean observed staffing level of 200 would provide a CV of 0.25 (or 25%).

The reader should also note that the range of observation is given for each set of results. While it is simply the range of the collected data, it defines the boundaries between which the results are statistically valid. Although, in practice, it is reasonable to extend the relationships a small distance beyond these boundaries, such an extension should be made conservatively and with appropriate care.

A. DATA COLLECTION

Having determined the variables to be investigated for significance as specified in Section II.1., we first attempted to collect the information at the headquarters level. It became quickly apparent that most of the information was unavailable, unverifiable, or unr liable. It was, therefore, decided that visits to selected field offices would be needed.

Field offices to be visited were selected on the basis of broad coverage of office size, type of contractor work performed (new construction, repair, spares production), and equipment produced. We attempted to be as consistent as possible concerning definitions and data sources. In many instances, however, data had to be developed from individual contract files, internal office records or personal files (especially for data in the 1967-1968 time frame). Definitions were not consistent and some data had to be subjectively modified in an attempt to achieve consistency. Some data were simply not available at either headquarters or field level.

B. AWALYSIS

Prior to the application of any statistical analysis, a method of handling blanks (missing data) in the data matrix and some general hypotheses on the homogeneity of the population had to be developed.

The problem of missing data points was resolved by the insertion of means. The approach enabled us to use available computer programs to analyze the data that were available for a time-observation for those variables where the data were missing. Using subjective judgment of the specific variable and the amount of missing data, the inserted means were computed from preceding and subsequent observations, the office for the entire time period studied, or the entire population for the total time period.

Preliminary regressions and determinations of the standard deviation were made on all the data to check on the homogeneity of the population. The dispersion of the data led to further testing resulting in a decision to consider the CAS offices under each SYSCOM as separate populations. All results are shown on that basis.

Three approaches were used on the data after modification as noted above. They were: linear regression analysis; curvilinear regression analysis (linear analysis of logarithmic transformations of the variables); and a method best described as a graphical approximation to multi-variable non-linear relationships. From an analysis of the residuals (the

The first two methods are adequately treated in any standard text on statistical inference such as <u>Applied Regression Analysis</u>, by N. R. Draper and H. Smith, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966. A complete exposition of the graphical approximation method can be found in <u>Methods of Correlation and Regression Analysis</u>, 3rd Edition, by M. J. B. Ezekiel and K. A. Fox, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1959.

THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O

difference between the actual and computed values of the dependent variable), the graphical approximation method did not appear to be as useful as a combination of the first two methods. Therefore, we dropped consideration of the graphical method in subsequent analyses and concentrated on the development of various linear and curvilinear relationships.

The preliminary regression analyses indicated that relatively few of the variables studied provided any significant historical relationship to actual staffing. The remaining analyses were directed toward providing a maximum coefficient of determination (R²) and a minimum standard error (SE). To achieve these goals, many subjective trade-offs had to be made.

We also applied the Durbin-Watson statistic as a test for serial correlation of the data and found a strong implication of serialization. In other words, the value of a variable was influenced by its value in the previous time period as well as by its relationship with another variable. We were able to minimize the effect of serialization by using three or four time periods rather than all ten. This resulted in very minor changes in the equations and the smaller sample size was accepted as being definitive for the relationship.

The implication of this adjustment for future updating of the equations is that time periods should be chosen so that there are intervening time periods which are not considered. For instance, an annual update could use data from any one quarter only. Those data would be multiplied by four to annualize them prior to applying the equations in this report.

In summary, the analysis involved:

- studying the scatter diagrams showing the raw plots of the total personnel in an office versus different independent variables to get an impression of the types of relationships involved.
- 2. analyzing the correlation matrix to see which independent variables were correlated with the dependent variables, and also which independent variables were auto-correlated, i.e., were related to one another. It is preferable to deal with independent variables that are not related to one another as more information can be extracted from the results of the regression equations.
- 3. running the step-wise regression program to determine the most significant variables to enter the regression equation.
- 4. using the t-test to test the coefficients for significant difference from zero to determine whether specific variables should be retained in the equation.
- 5. studying the analyses of variance table, F ratio and R² to determine the significance of the contribution of an independent variable to the coefficient of determination.
- 6. examining the standard error of the estimate of the regression equation and placing 68% and 95% confidence limits on the results.
- 7. application of the Durbin-Watson statistic to test for serial correlation.

C. TESTING

A primary concern of the study was the development of staffing criteria which could be used to estimate or predict future staffing levels for all offices--not only those sampled.

We obtained staffing data on a total office basis from the Office of Civilian Manpower Management-Navy (OCMM) for June 1972 as well as for the entire period of the study. These data were used to test the results for prediction purposes (Tables 4 through 6).

As the test results indicate, the regression equations give unsatisfactory estimates of staffing needs on a specific office basis. Therefore, we do not recommend their use for that purpose under current management practices. It is also noted that at least two offices were outside the range of observation when test data were used. We have identified them separately to show how the equation would have predicted their levels were it used outside its relevant range. In general, the further from the range of observation, the less reliable are the results. We would, therefore, suggest that the data base be updated to incorporate these extreme observations before the equations derived from it are used in describing the work relationships of offices displaying such extreme data points.

Table 4 TEST OF SUPSHIP STAFFING CRITERIA

Dependent Variable: Total SUPSHIP Personnel

Equation: Total Personnel = $170.8 (\log X_1) + 0.013X_2 - 620$

 X_1 = Annual rate of progress payments (thous. of \$)

	$x_2 = An$	nual num	ber of	change	es process	eđ	(1) (0	. (
Sampled	Dec	ember 19	71			June 197	2 (1) (2	
<u>Offices</u>	Computed	<u>Actual</u>	Diff.	<u>%</u>	Computed	<u>Actual</u>	Diff.	%
1	146	107	-39	 36	. 150	102	-48	-47
2	344	397	53	13	484	426	-58	-14
3	334	322	-12	- 4	380	353	-27	- 8
4	349 '	388	39	10	322	396	74	19
5	60	50	-10	-20	96	51	-4 5	-88
6	118	. 188	70	37	150	(3)	A4 449	
7	165	219	54	25	207	210	3	1
8	90	54	-36	- 67	61	(3)		****
9	221	290	69	24	205	317	112	35
10	1:42	225	83	37	149	187	38	20
Sub- Totals		2240	271	12%		2042	49	2%
Other Offices	(1) (2)							
11	- 3	126	129	(4)	71	118	47	40
12	-1 96	15	211	(4)		no repor	ts ava	ilable
13	43	55	12	22	11	49	38	78
14	159	142	-17	-12	142	118	-24	-20
15	192	99	-93	-94	172	101	-71	-7 0
Sub-tota	als	296	- 98	-33%		386	-10	- 3%
Totals	3	2536	173	7%		2428	39	2%

N	~	T)	2	

- (1) Military personnel estimates added to OCMM report (actual based on sample military to civilian ratio)
- (2) Data for changes were not available and a proxy was substituted in the calculation.

Estimated changes =

(Sample mean of changes) X observed progress (Sample mean of progress payments) payments

- (3) Not listed in OCMM report.
- (4) Independent variable outside of range of observation--not used in computing %.

Table 5
TEST OF NAVAIR NAVPRO STAFFING CRITERIA

Dependent Variable: Total NAVPRO Personnel Equation: Total Personnel = 39 + 0.00024X₁

 X_1 = Annual rate of value of shipments (thous. of \$)

	D	ecember	1971			June 197	₂ (1)	
Sampled Offices	Computed	<u>Actual</u>	Diff.	<u>%</u>	Computed	<u>Actual</u>	Diff.	<u>%</u>
1	112	219	107	49	197	239	42	18
2	80	77	- 3	- 4	72	85	13	15
3	266	220	-46	-21	217	231	14	6
4	116	108	- 8	- 7	108	111	3	3
5	41	35	- 6	-17	42	37	- 5	-1.4
6	219	168	-51	-30	. 141	169	28	17
7	159	121	-38	-31	145	(2)		
Sub-Tota		948	-45	- 5%		872	105	12%
Other Of	fices ⁽¹⁾							
8 .	66	(2)	***	-	(2)	tra gay		
9	68	64	- 4	- 6	64	67	3	4
10	80	(2)		***	(2)			
Sub-tota	1	64	- 4	- 6%		67	3	4%
Total		1012	- 53	- 5%		939	108	12%

NOTES:

- (1) Military personnel estimates added to OCMM report as noted on Table 4.
- (2) Not listed in OCMM report.

Table 6

TEST OF NAVORD NAVPRO STAFFING CRITERIA

Dependent Variable: Total NAVPRO Personnel Equation: Total Personnel = 0.00081X, - 15

 $X_1 = Annual rate of value of shipments (thous. of $)$

	Dec	ember 19	71		Jui	ne 1972 ⁽	1)	
Sampled Offices	Computed	<u>Actual</u>	Diff.	<u>%</u>	Computed	<u>Actual</u>	Diff.	<u>%</u>
1	108	126	18	14	103	123	20	16
2	68	46	-22	-48	83	45	-38	-84
3	315	363	48	13	363	(2)		
4	43	98	55	56	72	(2)		
5	38	53	15	28	43	50	7	· 14
Sub-tota		686	114	16%		218	-11	- 5%
Other Of	fices (1)							
6	85	137	52	38	67	132	65	49
Total		823	166	20%		350	54	15%

NOTES:

- (1) Military personnel estimates added to OCMM report as noted on Table 4.
- (2) Not listed in OCMM report.

D. OTHER STATISTICAL FINDINGS

In addition to the equations and graphs given in the previous Chapter, other statistical information may be useful to the reader in understanding the applicability of the results. This is especially true when applying the equation to an existing situation. Attention should be given to the coefficient of variance and the confidence limits so that the appropriate management judgment may be given during a review of a SYSCOM's needs.

1. For SUPSHIP offices:

Equation:

$$Y = 170.8 \text{ (log } X_1) = 0.013X_2 - 620 \text{ (defined on page 10).}$$

$$R^2 = 0.75$$

$$SE = 63$$

$$CV = 27\%$$

Means:

$$\frac{\overline{Y} = 230}{\frac{\log X_1}{X_2} = 2352}$$

Confidence limits:

$$68\% = \frac{1}{6}3$$

 $95\% = \frac{1}{2}2$

Range of observations:

$$X_1$$
 (thous. of \$) = \$3,408 to \$360,364 $X_2 = 34$ to 9648

2. For NAVAIR offices:

Equation:

$$Y = 39 + 0.00024X_1$$
 (defined on page 15).
 $R^2 = 0.91$

$$SE = 24$$

$$CV = 16\%$$

Means:

$$\overline{Y} = 148$$

$$\bar{x}_1$$
 (thous. of \$) = \$458,293

Confidence limits:

$$68\% = +24$$

$$95\% = \frac{+}{47}$$

Range of observations:

$$X_1$$
 (thous. of \$) = \$5,822 to \$1,195,946

3. For NAVORD offices:

Equation.

$$Y = 0.00081X_1 - 15$$
 (defined on page 15)
 $R^2 = 0.92$

$$SE = 36$$

$$CV = 25\%$$

Means:

$$\overline{Y} = 144$$

$$\bar{X}$$
 (thous. of \$) = \$197,094

Confidence limits:

$$95\% = \frac{+}{7}$$

Range of observations:

$$X_1$$
 (thous. of \$) = \$78,012 to \$479,600

Appendix A

HATAM HATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKATAMAKA

District.

TOTAL STATE

Tarrette I

Transmit I

Carrier of

Section 1

1

1

or o with the same carterial rest of

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE Washington, D. C.

Installations and Logistics

DATE: 30 Mar 1971

TASK ORDER SD-271-147 (Task 71-8 Rev.)

- 1. Pursuant to Articles I and III of the Department of Defense Contract No. SD-271 with the Logistics Management Institute, the Institute is requested to undertake the following task:
 - A. <u>TITLE</u>: Review of Nav, Contract Administration Field Activities
- B. SCOPE OF WORK: This task entails a review and analysis of the organization, functional responsibilities, interface relationships workload trends and staffing criteria of selected headquarters and field Contract Administration Services (CAS) activities under the command of the Chief of Naval Material. It is anticipated that some field activities may be assigned additional important responsibilities over the next several months. It is appropriate at this time to evaluate the organization, responsibilities, and personnel resources of these activities against current and projected contract administration requirements.

In performing this task, LMI will:

- 1) Review and analyze the organization, functional responsibilities, interface relationships, and workload trends of headquarters and field CAS activities which will include but need not be limited to:
 - a) <u>Headquarters</u>:
 - (1) Naval Material Command
 - (2) Naval Air Systems Command
 - (3) Naval Ordnance Systems Command
 - (4) Naval Ship Systems Command

b) Field:

(1) Naval Air Systems Command Representative-Atlantic

			' <u>cc</u>	PY		Appendix A
444443488		•				Page 2
300 S 100 S		•	(2)		Air Systems (Pacific	Command Representa
it biolitical training			(3)	Naval	Plant Represe	entative Offices:
new Series				(a) (b)	Bethpage Burbank	
Seller of the Seller		•		(c) (d) (e)	Dallas East Hartford Pomona	I
, CONTRACTOR			(4)	_	visors of Ship on, and Repair	obuilding, Con-
TANGARIAN PAR				(a) (b) (c)	Groton Newport News Pascagoula	
and de la		2)	tion, fun	nctional		ons in organiza- and operations
GONGO PA		3)			rface relation	_
rikoszkici roskio.		-	program c	offices, other D	above with be with Defense oD personnel a plants.	contractors,
Sheksatt		4)	_		op staffing c	
enteres establication of the control			contacts,	in add	ties. It is e ition to those obtain meaning	e in 1) above,
					orrelation ted proposed crit	
	Perfector details	. 5)	tions and	d incorp		and recommenda- a report, with cionale.
		2. SCHEDULE: 1 December 1972.	The fir	nal repo	rt will be sub	omitted by
SHIRIDAN			•		/s/Glenn_t	7. Gibson
************	i.	ACCEPTED /s/ Wm. F	Finan			
A PROPERTY OF	1	DATE 30 March 197				
MR CROSS						
Transaction of the second		1 As extended from	om 31 Marc	h 1972.		·
A-100 A-10						

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY NAVAL SHIP SYSTEMS COMMAND Washington, D.C. 20360

01P2:GND:11o Ser 68-01P2 15 Mar 1971

From: Commander, Naval Ship Systems Command

To: Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics)

Subj: Logistics Management Institute review of Navy Contract Administration Organizations

Ref: (a) ASD (I&L) task order to LMI number SD-271-147, task 71-8 of 1 December 1970

(b) Bureau of the Budget Circular A-11 dtd June 15, 1970

- 1. Reference (a) tasked the Logistics Management Institute (LMI) to review and analyze the organization, functional responsibilities, interface relationships, and workload trends of various Headquarters and field Contract Administration Service (CAS) activities, including several of the Supervisors of Shipbuilding, Conversion, and Repair, and Naval Ship Systems Command (NAVSHIPS) Headquarters.
- 2. It is requested that reference (a) be amended to include the requirement for identifying workload indicators for the functions under study which LMI determines would form valid bases for the development of the staffing criteria in section 13.3 of reference (b). This information would assist NAVSHIPS in further improving workload/workforce balance in these areas.
- 3. For further information or assistance, Mr. George Deihl (NAVSHI.S) 01P2, OX2-3190 or OX2-8191) is the NAVSHIPS point-of-contact on staffing criteria, and will be available on request.

/s/ N. Sonenshein-

Excerpt from BUREAU OF THE BUDGET Circular A-11 June 15, 1970

Section 13.3 (underlining added)

es processes de la compacta de la c

13.3 Estimates relating to numbers of personnel.

Estimates for the budget year should reflect the most efficient utilization of manpower (see Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-64, as amended by Transmittal Memorandum No. 1). To the maximum extent possible, the estimates are to represent agency plans covering both manpower inputs and work outputs required for implementing program objectives and exercising appropriate managerial control.

Estimates of manpower requirements for measurable workloads should be based on forecasts of workload and manpower productivity wherever feasible (see section 24.4). Statistical standards may be used in the development of productivity trends and to express the relationship between workload indicators and manpower requirements.

The estimates for staffing requirements will assume that improvements in skills, organization, procedures, and supervision will steadily increase capployee productivity and at the same time maintain adequate quality. Where automatic data processing equipment is installed, special gains in employee productivity will ordinarily be budgeted after the first year.

Personnel currently authorized will be utilized to the maximum extent in staffing new programs and expansions in existing programs, and a reduced number of personnel should generally be planned where the workload is stable. Estimates of staffing requirements for on-going as well as new programs will be based upon quantitative forecasts of workload for each program, together with adequate substantive data for converting workload to required personnel. Increases in staffing will be approved only when it is demonstrated that essential functions cannot be performed with existing employees.

Appendix B

OFFICES CONTACTED AND VISITED

During Both Phases of the Study

Department of Agriculture

Economic Research Service Statistical Reporting Service

Department of Defense

Directorate for Contract Administration Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installation & Logistics)

Defense Supply Agency, Contract Administration Services
Office of Plars and Management
Executive Directorate for Contract Administration
Executive Directorate for Quality Assurance
Executive Directorate for Production

Department of the Air Force

Deputy Chief of Staff for Systems and Logistics, Directorate of Procurement Policy

Air Force Systems Command
Directorate of Procurement Support
Air Force Contract Management Division

Department of the Navy

Assistant Vice Chief of Naval Operations
Director of Naval Administration,
History (Naval) Division

Office of Civilian Manpower Management
Manpower Information Division

Deputy Chief of Naval Material(Procurement and Production)
Acquisition Management Review Division
Contract Administration Division
Procurement Management Division

Naval Air Systems Command Headquarters
Organization and Manpower Management Office
Material Acquisition Directorate, Contract Administration Service and Quality Assurance Branch

Naval Ordnance Systems Command Headquarters
Product Assurance Division, Contract Administration
Services Branch

Naval Air Systems Command Representative—Atlantic Naval Air Systems Command Representative Contract Support Department Quality Assurance and Engineering Department

Naval Air Systems Command Representative—Pacific Contract Support Department

Naval Plant Representative Offices
Akron, Ohio
Baltimore, Md.
Bethpage, N. Y.
Burbank, Calif.
Dallas, Texas
Dothan, Ala.
East Hartford, Conn.
Great Neck, N. Y.
Pittsfield, Mass.
Pomona, Calif.
Silver Spring, Md.
Stratford, Conn.
Sunnyvale, Calif.

Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair Offices
Bath, Maine
Bay City, Mich. (Resident Office)
Boston, Mass.
Groton, Conn.
New Orleans, La.
Newport News, Va.
Pascagoula, Miss.
Portsmouth, Va.
San Deigo, Calif.
Seattle, Wash.
Sturgeon Bay, Wisc.

Appendix C

DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES USED

The results of this study are expressed as equations with one or more independent variables used to determine the number of personnel utilized historically to perform the work of an office or division within an office. Because of differences among SYSCOMs, the variables must be defined to insure consistent data.

The field phase of the study included the gathering of data on 25 independent and 9 dependent variables. For various reasons, these were reduced to 22 independent and 6 dependent variables for NAVPROs and 17 independent variables for SUPSHIPS. As a result of our analyses, a total of 8 independent variables have been chosen to provide relationships to the 6 dependent variables.

The definitions of the 14 variables finally used are given below. The definitions of the 20 initial variables which were eventually dropped are available at LMI.

Dependent Variables:

All dependent variables concern the number of personnel (both civilian and military) in an office or department/division of an office. Thus variable "total SUPSHIP/NAVPRO personnel" refers to all government employees, military and civilian, clerical, professional, and supervision, who are assigned to a SUPSHIP or NAVPRO office for the purpose of performing CAS functions. If an unusual, non-CAS oriented function is assigned to the office for administrative purposes, its personnel should

not be included in the total.

The organizational sub-divisions refer to the usual divisions or departments specified in NAVSHIPS 0900-000-3010 (the SACAM), NAVAIRINST 5000.6, and NAVORDINST 5000.2.

Note that separate equations are not given for the function of command or command staff—those individuals not assigned to a specific functional division but who act in a staff or advisory capacity to the Commander. They are included in the equations for total office personnel.

Within the divisions, the variable "personnel" includes all government employees, military and civilian, including the division chief.

Independent Variables:

1. Value of Shipments/Progress Fayments.

The purpose of this variable is to serve as a description of the work performed by the contractor under contracts administered by the CAS office. The data may be in the form of progress payments, invoices paid, or value of goods accepted by the government. Progress payments are generally encountered in angle unit, high value items (i.e., new ship construction). Value of goods accepted is generally encountered in multiple-unit, long term contracts such as air frames, engines, and electronics. Invoices paid are usually descriptive of short term efforts such as repair work or purchases of spares.

In all cases, we attempted to use that measure which provided the most accurate value description of the contractor's work.

The forms used as data sources were NAVSHIPS 4350/4, NAVAIR 5220 and NAVORD 4330-14.

2. Changes.

During the life of any contractual document, changes and modifications are made that
must be evaluated in some way by the CAS office.
These changes are designated by many terms in
the various commands and offices. We attempted
to insure that all significant work-producers
were counted and, therefore, were unable to
use the same term in all offices.

Basically, however, we requested information on cost/price proposals in NAVPROs and changes and job order modification in SUPSHIPs.

We found a very poor availability of data on changes and relied heavily on personal and local files. Because of this, we believe that the raw data on changes to be the least reliable of the variables used in the final equations.

3. Number of Firm Fixed Price (FFP) Contracts.

This variable covered only major contracts and excluded all other contractual documents such as purchase orders, job orders, letter contracts, etc. In SUPSHIPs, the only office where this variable showed as significant, we obtained data on FFP new contraction and overhaul contracts and Master Ship Repair contracts.

4. Terminations and Closeouts.

This variable was significant only for SUPSHIPS. For NAVPROS, the term includes only terminations for cause or convenience and completions or closeouts of contracts excluding purchase orders, job orders, etc. For SUPSHIPS, however, the term also includes the completion or closeout of job orders under Master Ship Repair contracts in addition to new construction and major overhaul contracts.

5. Value of Government Property.

This variable includes the value of land, buildings, industrial plant equipment, special tooling and special test equipment held by the contractor. The variable excludes material and other special categories such as bailed aircraft, floating drydocks, military equipment, etc.

Contracts over 90% Completed.

This variable was used for NAVAIR NAVPROS only. It refers only to prime contracts on which over 90% of the hardware has been delivered and the contract is still open.

7. Contractor Personnel - Technical and Production.

The final equations included contractors' production personnel for SUPSHIPs and contractors' technical personnel for NAVPROs. In both cases the data include only the contractor personnel involved in government work under the cognizance of the local CAS office.

For SUPSHIPS, the data were available from NAVSHIPS form 4350-2. For NAVPROS, the data were obtained directly from the contractor on the basis of consistency with OMB 22-R-261.

Variables for which data were collected but not used

- 1. Dependent variables
 - a) SUPSHIP/NAVPRO operating budget
 - b) SUPSHIP/NAVPRO total civilian hours paid
 - c) SUPSHIP/NAVPRO personnel on Command staff
- 2. Independent variables
 - a) Number of contractors serviced
 - b) Number of plants serviced
 - c) Average distance to plants serviced
 - d) Type of contractor facility
 - e) Number of items of government property held by contractor
 - f) Undelivered balance of production and R and D contracts administered by SUPSHIP/NAVPRO
 - g) Number of contract documents (active and inactive) being administered by SUPSHIP/ NAVPRO
 - h) Number of cost-type prime contracts being administered by SUPSHIP/NAVPRO
 - i) Number of fixed-price-incentive prime contracts being administered by SUPSHIP/ NAVPRO
 - j) Number of government agencies with contracts administered by SUPSHIP/NAVPRO

- k) Number of contractor's purchase orders submitted for SUPSHIP/NAVPRO approval
- 1) Value of contractor's purchase orders submitted for SUPSHIP/NAVPRO approval
- m) Number of forms DD 250 processed
- n) Number of Quality Assurance personnel employed by contractor on government work
- o) Number of clerical personnel employed by contractor on government work
- p) Number of managerial personnel employed by contractor on government work
- q). Total contractor employees on government work

The state of the s Appendix D

INPUT DATA TO ANALYSIS

The following is a table of the data upon which our analysis was based. Values are shown only for those variables which are represented in a regression equation. Data collected for variables which were later found to be insignificant are omitted. It should be noted that only the time periods underlined were actually utilized in computing the equations. Where a better fit was found by transforming the variable to logarithmic form, the transformation was made but the data on the table reflect the raw values. In some cases when values of variables were missing, the mean for that office was substituted in its place. The sub-totals for each department do not add up to the total for an office because the personnel on the Command staff were not included.

See Appendix C for precise definition of variables.

	TECHN.	Pers.	1752	1,695	1619	1577	2082	2163	1937	1773	1679	1742	1076	1090	1058	1093	1121	1158	1136	1065	1024	1075	. 3472	3476	3071	2910	2936	3274	2910	2788	2776	2588
VARIABLES	CHANGE ,	ORDERS	1510	1228	2208	851	959	1166	2025	968	1009	1206	22*	22*	21	24	38	. 23	26	20	18	7	322*	255	268	339	395	289	354	302	300	395
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	VALUE	SHIPPED	145127	120508	121900	131759	127716	115928	134877	114129	116263	111006	51477*	51477*	51478*	51478*	46852	49678	53211	53716	54317	51091	225365*	225365*	225365*	225365*	225365*	213246	241197	237373	220112	ത
	PROP	HELD	85000	85000	85000	81000	102000	101000	79000	78000	95000	87000	53222	53541	52065	49606	59896	61706	62599	65193	67582	70064	112722	124004	142434	146763	152289	200521	203795	199016	201452	197416
		TOTAL	197*	187	176	173	171	168	134	127	128	126	35	32	32	33	32	30	29	38	41	46	315	334	327	331	386	377	381	383	379	363
. ES	G G	MAT/IND	38*	35	34	35	34	37	28	27	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	14	39	44	41	43	51	50	52	51	49	87
VARIABLES	ON BOARD	Ą.	\$89	55	50	46	46	45	35	34	34	34	0	0	0	0	7	2	7	3	3	5	100	110	108	109	143	142	143	153		152
DEPENDENT	PERSONNEL (1 .	16*	14	13	14	14	14	10	7	ω	æ	16 *	15	15*	15	12	10	œ	6	8	ω	82	83	79	80	83	80	79	75	73	73
EAEC	PERS	CNTRS	46*	48	45	45	44	41	37	37	36	35	10*	6	*6	10	10	10	10	11	6	&	36	36	36	37	44	43	44	43	42	37
		ADMIN	29*	28	27	26	26	22	15	.13	14	14	*9	ហ	5*	.C	ហ	5	ហ	5	9	ဖ	48	51	53	52	55	52	51	49	46	41
		TIME	Н	2	m	4	ιΩ	9	7	8	δ	10	; r	0	m	4	ហ	9	7	8	0	10	r-I	7	m	4	יעי	9	7	α	σ	10

~

m

THE THE PARTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PART

į

OFFICE

Barren C.

	90% 80%	COMPL.	•		•																		35	31	38	23	30	ຕ	31	73	119	123
	TECHN.	PERS.	1821	1905	2065	2094	2116	2000	1808	1689	1605	1472	1308	1322	1231	1160	1148	1094	1043	985	948	896	4232*	5006	4761	4821	5155	5316	3928	3663	2821	2624
VARIABLES	CHANGE,	ORDERS	202	358	464	398	542	337	445	470	481	501	118	71	104	92	65	89	64	62	98	57		-								
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	VALUE	SHIPPED	40159	44993	46477	41993	45741	39895	47051	43209	39006	40311	58811	61874	53144	51572	40941	48097	38061	37766	36000	32000	455968	393881	343845	354473	434779	350497	296055	298830	386396	IO.
	PROP	HELD	36376	35825	36568	38421	37949	36311	36724	36625	36685	38882	43219	44995	40625	36325	43783	52242	49232	43558	39188	34847	63079	87444	99682	116877	139513	153106	169202	156170	144870	138761
		TOTAL	92	88	100	66	101	96	86	86	98	86	20	73	73	73	74	72	60	54	54	53	226	229	240	241	247	230	222	222	223	219
CES	BOARD	MAT/IND	19	19	20	20	20	18	19	20	20	19	11	1.1	11	11	13	12	11	10	10	10	50 *	21	26*	27	28*	26	26	24	24	23
/ARIAB	ON BO	er.		25	32	32	32	32	31	31	31	31	28	29	29	29	28	28	25	23	22	22	147	146	139	139	139	134	120	116	112	112
DEPENDENT VARIABLES	PERSONNEL	ENGR		25	26	25	25	24	25	25	25	26	Ŋ	2	5	Ŋ	5	5	m	٣	m	m	10*	10	13*	13	14*	12	12	12	-	11
DEPEN	PERS	CNTRS	17	11	12	12	13	14	14	14	14	14	თ	11	10	11	10	10	7	7	ω	8	16*	17	24*	24	25*	23	23		20	18
٠		ADMIN	4	4	5	ຮ	2	4	4	4	4	4	12	12	13	13	13	12	თ	7	7	7	13*	14	13*	13	14*	11	11	12	12	12
		TIME	r	2	m	4	ເດ	9	7	æ	Ø	10	٦	7	m	4	ស	9	7	8	σ	10	~ -1	~	m	4	ı LO	9	7	ω	0	10
		OFFICE	4	•									ហ										œ	•		-						

.

San	CONTR.	COMPL.		ი ი -	25	1 C) (212	24	25) ()	27	134	1 6	110	ון ה רוכ	1 0 1	220	2 0	215		143	0 / +	4.04.	48*	4 V	40 *	48*	4 6 7	464	464	46	*67
nt varlab	CONTR.	PERS.	2	3371 1961	1221	1336	1196	1069	1018	856	597	591	9519	10399	10650	9907	3000	10675		9629	0 0	7300	000	すっけい	2800	4	5398	(OI	5622	7	5136	4856	4485
Independent variables	VALITE	SHIPPED	א נאט ה	94	1975	86	9415	136419	123578	133201	88470	84069	464266	524960	552973	517840	508667	444699	426764	511919	406876	473433	0000	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	12061	10001	103308	151249	36	308199	320103	174355	161337
; ;	GOVT	HELD	79109	636	106272	98335	91377	90303	35430	81902	75180	68458	404800	415600	408800	402000	395300	491700	664500	678100	765600	954900	275.50*	27850*	19100	27850*		29300		4100	85	28900	27850*
		TOTAL	86	93	94	98	95	89	78	78	76	77	290	292	287	294	296	295	285	280	214	220	124	133	134	127	128		٦,	777		111	108
LES	BOARD	MAT/IND		17	17	20	20	61		18	18	18	36	37	. 37	36	41	43	41	40	43	42	24	25	26	25	25	22	1 6		, r		77
ENT VARIABLES	NO O	O.	28	32	32	32	32	31	C7	24	24	24	143	TCT	150	760	161	155	150	148	78	89	45	49		47	45	45	3.5	2.2	70	27	
NDENT	PERSONNEL	ENGR	11	111	12	T3		T 7	77	-	ا لا	ي در	מ נ	77	77	0 7	13	23	24	23	23	23	12	13	13	12	13	-	0	5	9 0	1=	1
DEPEND	PER	CNTRS	17	17	T.	9 F	13	77	13	7 7	7.5	77) - T	1,7	4. Ն ⊣ C	0 0	40	თ (ო (38	36	35	ဗ	70	24	24	24	24	23	22	22	22	22	I I
		ADMIN	10	07	- - - - -	T	77	ς α	α	0 α	0	ω α α	, c	23	2 2	0 6		7 7 7 7	77	21	23	20 .	7 7		12	T T	10	8	6	6	0	8	
		TIME	Н (4	n <	ታዣ	۷	7 0	α	ာ တ	15) r-	۱ ۸	~) 4	י ע		0 1	1,	∞ α	7) -	-1 c	7	m «	7 1	2	9	7	ထ	6	10	
	7. T.	7777	7									ω										σ	•										

The second

SE	CONTR. 90%	COMPL.	ហ	2	7	ന	က	4	ນ	7	9	9	40	48	61	63	61	72	68	81	88	96	29	26	20	24	30	36	27	28	30	88
RIAE	CONTR. C	Pers. (134	70	58	52	64	58	71	52	63	9	2840	3196	3645	3948	3859	3302	3119	2552	. 2346	2457	3094	3085	3488	4129	2606	2778	1705	1665	0447	1569
INDEPEND	VALUE	SHIPPED	6938	3166	3617	4535	3599	2911	2186	2011	7703	4125	137873	189768	221593	270227	306532	353810	325458	298588	234162	224593	109100	150823	179601	148817	189707	131212	90	232300	מן מוני	82T052
	GOVT PROP	HELD	3148	4147*	5994	4147*	5556	4147*	3335	4147*	2701	4147*	105664	108800	121705	123087	135081	140528	146015	143754	142296	138566	36002	36002	36002	40073	38118	44676	50907	52589		45893
		TOTAL	55*	45	38	40	39	40	38	38	37	35	125	127	141	157	183	171	178	174	163	168	146	135	139	130	125	Н	120	119	-I[(121
BLES	BOARD	MAT/IND	*6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	19	20	22	24	28	26	30	30	27	26	26	25	24	24	22	22		23		T 0
VARIABLES	ON B	1	19*	16	13	14	14	15	15	15	15	15	52	52	58	65	70	89	69	67	64	99	51	20	51	20	46	39	37	37		32
DEPENDENT	PERSONNEL	ENGR	*	~	-1	Н	~	-1	~	1	-		13	13	15	19	21	21	19	20	20	23	11	10	11	თ	ത	6	11	12	57	Ιγ
DEP	EA EA	CNTRS	10*	7	7	7	7	9	ιΩ	૭	ß	5	23	23	26	27	31	30	35	32	31	32	. 27	23	24	23	23	22	22	21	13	20
		ADMIN	11.*	o	7	7	Ø	7	ហ	4	4	3	10	11	14	16	21	18	17	17	15	13	20	5	18	13	13	13	12	13	14	13
		TIME	~1	7	m	4	ហ	9	7	8	Ø	10	- -1	(1	٣	4	Ŋ	o	7	8	, o	10	·	, c	m	4	· ru	9	7	ω	6	10
		OFFICE	10										러						•				12	l f								

•	_	
Apper	ndix	D
Page	6	_

	CONTR.	PROD. Pers.	4	2230	2502		/007	740/	1776	1907	ופו	2071	209	200	449	796	# cc	ה ה ה ה	130	178	200	132	213	6376*	4806	7527	6947	7048	2703	6520	100k	2000	5700
RIABLES	CHANGES,	CHANGE	700	# 0 F	523	9 9 8	200	200	929	932	827	906	885	1054	701	196	21.0	, r	201	ተ ሪ ት ር	450	445	167	3191*	3291	4006	2439	2884	31.02	3108	0000	4824	2026
Independent variables		PPPC	α	σ	12) o	σ	1 01	7	ဖ	S	5	15	15	14	14	17	17	16	א ר ד	0 t	CT	12	12		15	. 15	15	15	15	ហ 	10	28
INDEPEN		TERMS.	•	C	0	·	0	0	2	н	Н	0	46	57	46	58	36	59	36	o o) (70	5 g	0 (2	m	ហ	7	7	8	m	-	. 2
	VALITE	SHIPPED	19502	071	12711	13084	14141	13059	11548	15556	11812	11124	3519*	3519*	3606	4660	5677	2486	3811	1704	1679	00404	4000	11/845	270/01	115406	98961	77	. 113295	114196	133915	123510	115997
		TOTAL	108	105	119	125	123	127	126	108	109	107	99	63	09	28	09	56	52	5.1	20	200	0 0	504	204	504	362	3 / L	360	363	374	383	388
BLES	BOARD	MAT/IND	19	19	25	28	27	28	26	22	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	c	o c) c		ָב כ	7 7	U 1	53	53	53	53	46
VARIA	NO	Ø	26	28	29	33	30	30	31	ი ე (17	70 70	o (0	0 (0	0	11	11	11	11	=	121	121	118	0 1 1	121	777	077	۲,	Ŋ		79
DEPENDENT VARIA	PERSONNEL	ENGR	38	35	39	38	34	31	30	72	97	97	7 4 5	4.2	42	40	39	37	35	34	32	32	153	153	, ,	י נ	121	1 6		T7	52		184
DEP	PE	CNTRS	12	10	12	12	12	18	17	\ \ \ \	CT	Τ - Σ -	T T	20	Σ <u>-</u>	T (0 T	7	9	9	3	3	57	57) (r		\cdot	40		7	40
		ADMIN	7	7	ω	∞ (∞ (8	0 7) C	21-) C	2 6	• •	4 (∞ α	ρ]:	_	7	1.1	12	31	31	32	30	000	9 6	22	<u>ي</u> د	ع ع	33	34 4
		TIME	н (7	m ·	4, 1	Ω (ا ٥	~ 0	0 0	0 5) -	4 C	4 0) <	ታ ኒ	n (ا (٥	\	ω .	6	10	Н	7	3	4	· w	v	1	- c	o o	20 6	0
		OFFICE	13									14	۲ ۱										15										

Tuesday.

Extension 1

					1				•		i																,		pe ge			<u>. D</u>
CONTR	PROD.	PERS.	15225	16075	16050.	15850	14150	15800	14800	12517	13139	17250	3099	3646	3241	3304	3360	3419	2852	1796	986	1093	7155	7743	7555	8524	6625	6553	-	S	9281	9154
RIABLES CHANGE.	CHANGE	ORDERS	846*	849*	849*	849*	849*	849*	. 849*	849*	849*	849*	1996*	1996*	2186	3003	2141	3084	2526	918	1287	826	393	393	280	280	162	162	181	182	188	188
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES CHANG		FFPC	* "	3*	4*	თ	9	ဖ	Н	-	0	0	41*	57	78	28	28	38	56	59	36	16	ო	4	ហ	ო	ហ	4	2	m	2	7
Indepen		TERMS.	*	1 *	*0	*	0	0	0	Н	1	2	220*	103	22.7	259	222	231	232	220	245	243	7	2	0	Н	0	0	0	o	0	0
	VALUE	SHIPPED	124241	98330	99397	75754	78311	128492	146209	131852	164789	165069	16836	21.570	17471	38893	29068	32869	12033	13285	42636	7940	29991	28168	36115	31942	47164	. 66565	98959	198509	147020	180182
		TOTAL	376	415	353	356	362	366	370	395	390	397	174	201	239	239	252	257	245	224	195	188	143	139	145	143	157	182	192	244	259	322
ABLES	BOARD .	MAT/IND	52	61	52	49	51	51	52	51	51	49	15	16	25	25	27	27	27	24	17	17	34		34	31	33	34	34	40	41	
VARI	NO	Ø	134	145	124	125	124	116	120	123	120	120	47	50	52	53	57	57	57	54	45	45	31	31	32	32	33	46	48	20	52	58
DEPENDENT VARIABLES	PERSONNEL	ENGR		119	104	103	102	107	96	106	110	111	77	96	111	111	116	120	110	103	95	88	28	28	30	. 29	39	z.	51	57	57	73
DEP	PE	CNTRS	20	22	18	18	22	23	20	24	22	24	24	28	31	.59	32	33	30	25	24	24	15	14	14	14	13	. 50	21	28	33	41
		ADMIN	41	51	39	44	45	52	48	53	52	57	10	10	18	18	17	17	18	1.5	12	12	14	13	13	14					28	
	,	TIME	Н	8	m	4	ហ	ဖ	7	ω	σ	101	Н	7	m	4	ស	ဖ	-	ω	0	21	~	7	٣	4	Ŋ	v	7	ω	ത	10
		OFFICE	16	• !									17										18						_			

j

nosanis and described and d

description of the second

Comments 1

i consequence		PROD.	
Contract Con	S	CHANGES, CHANGE ORDERS	
	CABLE		
	NDEPENDENT VARIABLES	FFPC	
	ENDEN	د	
	INDEP	TERMS	
To the second se		VALUE SHIPPED	
		IA SH	
		TOTAL	
Establish Establish		CND	
Transit of the state of the sta	CABLES	BOARD MAT/IND	
F	VAR	NO SA	
Trocker a	DEPENDENT VARIABLES	PERSONNEL ON S ENGR OA	•
E1-164-413	DEP	CNTR	•
Transmitte Printmitte Committee of the C		PE ADMIN CNTRS	
4 h		TIME	
		E	

Name of the last

				i				1	•		! !			•				f			•			•					ge	_	lix D
CONTR.	PROD.	400	3436 F	5024	6003 4	7289	7861	6793	2842	2534	2909	1741*	3069	2695	1820	2059	1065	1421	1577	1369	595	2900 *	1753	2861	3275	3408	4022	3847	2609	2596	73
CHANGES,	CHANGE	u r	7 6	280	212	382	17	53	723	450	250	285	314	287	313	289	268	165	129	129	110	2367*	2366*	2366*	2367*	2445	1454	3947	1476	3239	1640
	FFPC	76	2 4	41	36	32	30	44	31	33	24	22	28	28	24	26	23	23	20	19	18	23	56	52	45	. 54	28	45	5 6	37	40
	TERMS.	25	26	28	30	17	11	19	30	35	24	ហ	7	14	15	ဖ	13	5.	ო	4	က	356	97	261	219	243	130	131	136	163	196
	VALUE SHIPPED	19854	26774	44952	51730	53432	42548	36116	44704	26792	15138	17950	20650	21306	18442	21550	19480	16915	12835	11850	9269	47263	34827	46983	68336	4	47281	47800	391	68085	23717
	TOTAL	155	179	183	192	204	204	205	211	222	219	126	112	110	107	66	95	83	92	69	54	417	409	380	401	. 868	342	312	297	295	290
	ON BOARD OA MAT/IND	26	36	38	40	40	39	39	9 9	37	36	25*	21	21	21	18	15	13	13	12	Ø	25	30	35	37	6E	33	33	30	30	30
		24	26	30	35	43	48	49	55	84	81	40 *	36	35	35	33	32	27	24	20	16	87	76	67	98	79	89	23	20	44	4 4
	S ENGR	64	65	65	63	99	63	63	63	20	52	k 27	9	19	8 .	20	19	18	17	15	14	200	202	167	163	145	123	101	86		102
Ç	CNTRS	15	15	15	15	16	15	12	15	/	17	א א א	CT.	15	.T4	T4	14	12	10	10	ω	36	39	40	40	ლ ,	46	48	47		46
	ADMIN	14	16	15	17	16	16	16	97	40	9T) (9	on (ו ת	- 1		١٥	ហៈ	2	4	ლ (7.7	8 6	20	S 2	87	29	26	27	25
	TIME	Н	7	m	4	S,	9	7	ω α	אן	07	٦ ،	4	η ,	4 t	n v	ام	_ (ω (وا	01	⊣ (7	ν) •	4, r	Ω (0	· ·	ω (م ا	0
	OFFICE	19									C	0 7									į	77								•	

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Make a statement of the statement of the

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

CONTR	PROD.	4364	5266	5106	5634	5011	4924	4087	2733	1539
CHANGES.	CHANGE	826*	1292	7,335	1013	952	757	570	381	554
		\$00	2	200	M 4		504	4	54	25
	TERMS.	40.	54	ი - ი ი	א כ א ב	4 4	50	4 r	24	19
	SHIPPED	48760*	60500	74997	60328	25309	34927	38187 20761	10/07	n +
	TOTAL	362	361	357	341	322	286	# en	225) i
BOARD	MAT/IND	5. 7. 8.	56	ស	54	49	ა გ ჯ	37	30)
0	ð	90	77	78	75	9	ა ი 4 ა	45	34	
RSO, ME	S ENGR OA MA	111	111	108	101	98	8 8 8	81	92	
PE	CNTRS	46 50	20	25	40	45	. 4 0 4	36	40	
	ADMIN	44	43	43	4. 4 5. 4	34	31	24	23	•
!	TIME	r 7	m ·	4, r	ภษ	2	- ω	0	07	
1	SOLLANO	22								NOTES:

While all 10 time periods are *Mean value used; actual value missing or not reported. While all 10 time periods shown, only periods 2, 6, 9 or 2, 5, 7, 9 were used in formulating the regression

Data for "Value Shipped," "Terminations," and "Changes" are for the six months prior to the point of observation. To use these data on the same basis as the equations in this report, they must be multiplied by 5

3) Time periods:

Ç,	96	96	U)	96	96	1970	37	\sim	7
•								June 1	
						۲۰			10
									• •

Appendix E

STATISTICAL EQUATIONS

The computer program used to run the regression analysis was the Stepwise Regression (BMDO2R) of the Biomedical statistical package. Stepwise computes a sequence of regression equations, at each step adding to the equation that variable which makes the greatest reduction in the error sum of the squares. It is the variable with the highest partial correlation with the dependent variable after accounting for the variables already added.

The BMD source is written in FORTRAN and is generally available. We used a CDC 6600 series computer. The BMD reference manual clearly states the input format of the control cards to be used. The input data were punched into cards and the appropriate fields transformed to logarithmic form.

The statistical definitions and formulae referenced in the text of this report were the standard mathematical equations developed in most books but will be described below for the reader's convenience.

1. Mean or average

$$\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i,$$

where X is the ith observation

2. Range of observation of X equals

where X and X are the maximum and minimum values of X respectively.

3. Variance of
$$x = 0^2$$

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \overline{x})^2}{n}$$

4. Standard deviation of
$$X = \mathcal{O}$$

$$\mathcal{O} = \sqrt{\mathcal{O}^2}$$

$$cv = \frac{\sigma}{\overline{x}}$$

where \overline{X} is the mean of X

6. Coefficient of correlation =
$$\sqrt{x.y}$$

$$\sqrt{x.y} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_{i} - \overline{x}) (y_{i} - \overline{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_{i} - \overline{x})^{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_{i} - \overline{y})^{2}}}$$

7. Coefficient of determination =
$$R^2$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_i - \overline{Y})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_i - \overline{Y})^2}$$

where $Y_{i} = b_{o} + b_{1} X_{i}$ (computed value of Y_{i} at X_{i})

 $Y_{i} = actual value of Y at X_{i}$

8. F ratio

$$= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{Y}_{i} - \overline{Y})^{2}/k}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{Y}_{i} - \overline{Y})^{2}/(n-k)}$$

where k is the number of degrees of freedom associated with regression equation and n is the number of observations.

9. Confidence interval on Y evaluated at X, equals

$$\dot{Y}_{i} \pm t \quad (v, 1-\frac{\alpha}{2}) \quad . \quad \sigma_{y}.x$$

where t (v, 1. α) is the t statistic corresponding to v degrees of freedom and a two-tailed 1 - α confidence interval.

10. Residual e

$$e_{i} = Y_{i} - b_{o} - b_{1}X_{i}$$

represents the difference between the computed and actual values of Y at X_i

Appendix F

REGRESSION EQUATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS/DIVISIONS

In addition to finding a regression equation relating total personnel on board with its explanatory variables, the department/divisions for the offices were also investigated. By the very nature of a statistical approach to problem solving, a range of values rather than a point estimate is to be inferred from the equations. This range is given below for 68% and 95% confidence intervals respectively about the mean of Y_i , where $Y_i = b_0 + b_1 X_i$.

In theory the range about the mean is the minimum so we must consider this the best possible case. The range of variance for personnel is large when predicting a subset of the total office. The equations represent relationships found to be true in the past and cannot be sensitive to changes in organization policy or shifts of emphasis that may occur in the future. We do not, therefore, recommend that the equations be used for predictive purposes without appropriate management action. The departments studied were:

- 1. Administration
- 2. Contracts
- Engineering/Planning
- 4. Quality Assurance
- 5. Materials/Industrial

The equations and corresponding statistics are given below for each of the Commands. (See Appendix C for a more detailed definition of the independent variables).

SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL FINDINGS REGRESSION EQUATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS SUPSHIPS

ί...

Regression Equation for Personnel in:	R2	മ. ജ.	C.V.	C.I.68%**	C.I.95%**
ADMIN = $0.105X_1 - 2$				•	
x_1 = number of total personnel in CAS office	.77	7.0	.32	15-29	8-36
CONTRACTS = $14.8(\log x_1) + 0.311x_2 + 0.0022x_3 - 58$.71	8.3	.33	17-34	10-42
$X_1 = progress payments (thous.$)$, annual rate					
$X_2 = Firm fixed price contracts on hand$					
X_3 = number of changes, proposals, change orders processed per year					,
PLAN = 41.6($logx_1$) + 0.077 x_2 + 0.0085 x_3 -149	99.	28.7	.37	907-05	22-134
X, = progress payments (thous.\$), annual rate					
x_2 = number of terminations processed per year					
<pre>X₃ = number of changes, proposals, change orders processed per year</pre>					
$QA = 54.4(logx_1) + .0037x_2 - 211$.67	23	68.	35-81	13-103
X ₁ = progress payments (thous.\$), annual rate					
<pre>X₂ = number of changes, proposals, change orders processed per year</pre>					
$MAT = 27.7(logX_1) - 66$.64	10.9	98.	19-41	19-61
<pre>X₁ = number of contractor personnel in government production</pre>					

*Standard error of the estimate **Confidence intervals at $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ (mean of dependent variable)

a soften didentificant designation of the soften soften

Appendix F
Page 3

REGRESSION EQUATIONS FOR DIVISIONS NAVORD NAVORDS

and the second of the second o

Regression Equation for Personnel in:	R2	*∄.	C.V.	C.I.68%**	C.I.95%*
ADMIN = $0.141x_1 - 2$ x_1 = number of total personnel in CAS office	.94	4.7	.26	14-23	9-27
CONTRACTS = $40.1(\log x_1) + 8.4(\log x_2) - 207$ x_1 = value shipped (thous.\$), annual rate x_2 = number of changes processed per year	.94	4.2	.18	19-27	15-31
ENGR = 139.7(logx ₁)-424 X ₁ = number of contractor technical personnel on government work	.73	15.1	.58	11-41	0-55
QA = $0.00031x_1 - 13$ $X_1 = value$ shipped (thous.\$), annual rate	. 85	.9.5	.41	28–67	10-86
<pre>IND = 64.7(logX₁) + 24.2(logX₂) -302 X₁ = number of contractor technical personnel on government work X₂ = value of government property on hand (thous.\$)</pre>	68.	0.9	• 26	17-29	11-35

*Standard error of the estimate **Confidence intervals at Y (mean of dependent variable)

Appendix F Page 4

SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL FINDINGS
REGRESSION EQUATIONS FOR DIVISIONS
NAVAIR NAVPROS

Savera ve

Regression equation for Personnel in:	R ²	ດ.ສ. *•	C.V.	C.I.68%**	C.I.95%**
ADMIN = 0.058X ₁ + 4 X ₁ = number of total personnel in CAS office	69.	3.1	.24	10-16	7-19
CONTRACTS = 0.00001x ₁ + 13.3(logX ₂) - 4 x ₁ = Value shipped (thous.\$), annual rate x ₂ = number of contracts over 90% completed on hand	.81	4.6	.21	17-27	13-31
ENGR = 7.78($\log x_1$) - 13 x_1 = number of contractor technical personnel on government work	.70	3.9	.31	. 8–16	4-20
QA = $0.00014x_1 + 2$ x_1 = value shipped (thous.\$), annual rate	.81	21	.32	34-86	16-30
<pre>IND = 5.99(logX₁) + 8.36(logX₂) - 36 X₁ = number of contractor technical personnel on government work X₂ = value of government property on hand (thous.\$)</pre>	. 87	3.7	.16	19-27	101-195

*Standard error of the estimate **Confidence intervals at Y (mean of dependent variable)

Appendix G

in the second

NAME OF THE OWNER, OWNE

ADJUSTMENT FOR SERIALIZATION

When measuring observations for the same data over time in one office, there is danger that serialization may have taken place. In other words, the value of an observation is partially affected by preceding and subsequent values of the same data in addition to the effect of another variable. If serialization exists in a data set, the method of least squares may not give the best estimate of the relationships.

To test for serialization, we applied the Durbin-Watson statistic, d, as defined by the equation

$$d = \frac{\sum_{i=2}^{n} \left[(Y_i - \hat{Y}_i) - (Y_{i-1} - \hat{Y}_{i-1}) \right]^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2}$$

The data sets for ten consecutive points in time showed a positive result in serial correlation.

To overcome this potential defect in the regression equations, we arbitrarily chose time points 2, 6, and 9 for SUPSHIPS and 2, 5, 7, and 9 for NAVPROS as the bases for the regression equations. In most cases, the test for serialization then proved negative. Since the equations were very similar, we chose those equations based on the smaller number of time points. The following tables present the equations developed together with the Durbin-Watson statistic for each and a table of the relevant ranges for the statistic, d.

¹⁾ For a description and discussion of the Durbin-Watson statistic, see Statistics-An Introductory Analysis, 2nd Edition, T. Yamars, Harper and Row, New York, 1967, pp. 809-813.

TEST LIMITS FOR SERIALIZATION

The d Statistic

Significance points of d_L and d_U : 5%

Number of variables	1	L	:	2	3	
Number of observations	d _L	ď	$\mathtt{q}^{\mathbf{L}}$	ď	ďĽ	ď
· 20	1.20	1.41	1.10	1.54	1.00	1.68
28	1.33	1.48	1.26	1.56	1.18	1.65
30	1.35	1.49	1.28	1.57	1.21	1.65
50	1.50	1.59	1.46	1.63	1.42	1.67
70	1.58	1.64	1.55	1.67	1.52	1.70
100	1.65	1.69	1.63	1.72	1.61	1.74
If						
d < d _L	posit	tive ser	ial cor	relation	exists	
d > d	there	e is no	positive	e serial	correl	ation

 $d_L < d < d_U$ the test is inconclusive

SERIAL CORRELATION TEST ON SUPSHIP DATA

Prices;

NAME OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY

wante.

2000

Number of Observations	100		30	
Organization	Equation	d	Equation	ಶ
ADMIN	Y=0.102X ₁ -2	0.3838	0.3838 Y=0.105x ₁ -2	1.159
CONTRACTS	$Y=13.5(logx_1)+0.28x_2+0.00025x_3-52$	0.9505	Y=14.8(logx ₁)+0.311x ₂ +0.0022x ₃ -58	1.200
PLANNING	$Y=45.8(logx_1)+0.092x_2+0.0085x_3-171 0.9574$	0.9574	Y=41.6(logx ₁)+0.077x ₂ +0.0085x ₃ -149	1.647**
QA	$Y=54.5(logx_1)+0.0045x_2-213$	0.8339	$x=54.4 (logx_1)+0.0037x_2-211$	1.101
MATERIAL	Y=28.4 (logx ₁)-69	0.6739	Y=27.7(logX ₁)-66	1.931*
TOTAL PERSONNEL	TOTAL PERSONNEL $X=170.1(logx_1)+0.0175x_2-624$	0.7510	0.7510 Y=170.8(logx ₁)+0.013x ₂ -620	1.287**

* Test shows there is no positive serial correlation ** Test is inconclusive

A Marketon .

H

-

two contra

Appendix G Page 4

BERIAL CORRELATION TEST ON NAVAIR NAVPRO DATA

Number of Observations	70	Ç	. 28	•
Organization	Squation	ช	Bquation	ซ
ADMIN	Y = 0.057X ₁ +4	0.7521	¥ = 0.058x, + 4	2.144*
CONTRACTS	x = 0.00001x ₁ + 11.7(10gx ₂) -2	0.7740	x = 0.00001x, +13.3(logx,)-4	1.548**
BNOR	x = 7.73 (logx ₁) -13	0.4197	$x = 7.78(\log x_{1}) -13$	2.590*
Š	Y = 0.00014x1 +7	0.8556	x = 0.00014x1 +2	2.543*
INDUSTRIAL	Y = 6.58(logX ₁) + 7.34(logX ₂) -34	0.7546	$Y = 5.99(logx_1) +8.36(logx_2) -36$	2.000*
TOTAL PERSONNEL	x = 0.0023x1 +48	1.255	Y = 0.00024X1 +39	2.485#

* Test shows there is no positive serial correlation *** Trut is inconclusive

A CALLES OF THE SERVICE OF THE ROTT OF THE OWNER OW

Appendix G Page 5

SERIAL CORRELATION TEST ON NAVORD NAVPRO DATA

perental enter ent

1

The state of

Number of Observations	90		. 20	•
Organization	Equation	ซ	Equation	ರ
ADMIN	Y = 0.143x1 -2	6008.0	Y = 0.141X ₁ -2	0.9518
CONTRACTS	$Y = 42.5(log X_1) + 6.7(log X_2) -215$	1.139	$Y = 40.1(logx_1) +8.4(logx_2)-207$	2.210*
RNGR	$x = 137.3(logx_1) -415$	1.072	Y = 139.7(logx ₁) -424	2.377*
VO	x = 0.00030x ₁ -11	1.115	Y = 0.00031x ₁ -13	2.707#
INDUSTRIAL	$X = 58.7(\log X_1) + 25.4(\log X_2) - 288$	0.4057	$Y = 64.7(\log x_1) + 24.2(\log x_2) - 302$	2.283*
TOTAL PERSONNEL	x = 0.00079x1 -12	1.504**	v = 0.00081x ₁ -15	2.448*

*
Test shows there is no positive serial correlation
**
Test is inconclusive